Transgressing Frontiers Through the Radicalization of Pedagogy

Simon Springer, Marcelo Lopes de Souza, and Richard J. White

*Forthcoming in *The Radicalization of Pedagogy**

> New ideas germinate everywhere, seeking to force their way into the light, to find an application in life; everywhere they are opposed by the inertia of those whose interest it is to maintain the old order; they suffocate in the stifling atmosphere of prejudice and traditions.
>
> - Peter Kropotkin (1880/2002b, 35), *The Spirit of Revolt*

Introducing Anarchist Geographies

In an age that is desperately in need of critical new directions, anarchist geographies exist at the crossroads of possibility and desire. By breathing new life into the inertia of the old, anarchism intrepidly explores vital alternatives to the stasis of hierarchical social relations through the geographical practice of mutual aid, voluntary association, direct action, horizontality, and self-management. Despite the exciting and vigorous contribution to geography that key anarchist thinkers like Peter Kropotkin and Élisée Reclus made in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, anarchist praxis in the discipline remained highly underrepresented from the mid-twentieth century onwards. Perhaps owing to the pessimism of the war years, concerns for social justice declined in geographical thought and instead the discipline turned the bulk of its attention towards realpolitik. A quantitative revolution took hold of geography soon thereafter, dominating the scope of geographical inquiry until the 1970s, when the winds of change blew in as part of the wider counterculture movement. Anarchism was fortunately once again being actively considered within academic geography, where in 1978 the journal *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* published a landmark special issue on anarchist geographies (Breitbart 1978), while in 1981 the journal *Hérodote: Revue de Géographie et de Géopolitique* devoted an issue to the influence of Reclus (Lacoste 1981). Alongside Marxist, feminist, and postrstructuralist arguments, anarchist thought ultimately helped to lay the foundations for what has since become known as 'radical geography' (Peet 1977;

Chouinard 1994). Yet instead of inspiring a groundswell of anarchist writings within geography, the collective attention of radical geographers became primarily focused on Marxism from the 1980s onward (Springer 2014), owing in no small part to the prolific writings of David Harvey (1973, 1982, 1989). While there is little doubt that Harvey did a tremendous amount of good in locating capital at the center of geographical critique, a purely Marxian take leaves us with significant blind spots that cannot be reconciled within the econocentric lens of Marxism (Springer 2015).

Given the times, where the 1980s witnessed the rise of Thatcherism in the United Kingdom and Reaganomics in the United States, it is perhaps somewhat unsurprising that radical geography became so enthralled with criticizing capitalism. The fact that neoliberals were ostensibly attacking the foundations of the state allowed radical geographers to fall back on a lazy analysis that completely overlooked the ways in which the state – even under conditions of significant neoliberal reform – continued to be a primary site of domination, particularly for marginalized peoples. There remains a tendency among Marxist geographers to caricature anarchism as being somehow akin to neoliberalism insofar as both take aim at the state (Harvey 2015). Such confusion is only exacerbated by the oxymoronic tendencies of so-called 'anarcho-capitalists,' who would be more aptly referred to as 'neo-neoliberals.' Yet early anarchists knew well that the state and capital were one and the same, inseparable and intimately interlocked systems of domination that are effectively a single, self-reinforcing logic. As Kropotkin (1910/2002: 286) argued,

> the state was, and continues to be, the chief instrument for permitting the few to monopolize the land, and the capitalists to appropriate for themselves a quite disproportionate share of the yearly accumulated surplus of production. Consequently, while combating the present monopolization of land, and capitalism altogether, the anarchists combat with the same energy the state, as the main support of that system. Not this or that special form, but the state altogether, whether it be a monarchy or even a republic governed by means of the *referendum*.

In this light, the neoliberal dream of a stateless society is pure fantasy, an illusion that is repeatedly demonstrated false by the friction that capitalism produces as it digs its wheels

into the dirt and mud of material everyday life. So while neoliberals embrace capitalism and are simply confused – or actively deluding themselves – about its relationship to the state, anarchists appreciate their inextricable connection. Indeed, it is in this very recognition that anarchism and Marxism first diverged from a single strand of socialist thought (Springer 2013), where the former realized that any struggle against capitalism was necessarily a contestation of the state, while the latter were content to work within the parameters of the state in their resistance to capitalism.

History of course proved the anarchists correct, and the 20th century demonstrated that there was no communism in Russia under the Soviet Union, where "such a condition of affairs may be called state capitalism, but it would be fantastic to consider it in any sense Communistic... Soviet Russia, it must now be obvious, is an absolute despotism politically and the crassest form of state capitalism economically" (Goldman 1935, np). Given the *historical materialism* of state capitalism it is all the more surprising then that as the Berlin Wall came down, more radical geographers didn't abandon Marxism and make haste towards the greener pastures of anarchism. Instead, they held fast to a dead letter idea that was by the mid 1990s was starting to become a new orthodoxy within the discipline. That Marxism had become assimilated into state capitalist movements was apparently lost on the bulk of radical geographers at the time, a situation that remains acute today among those committed to a more dogmatic version of Marxism in refusing to accept any critique and dismissing valid concerns as being "just not true" (Mann 2014). Yet owing to "an incredible irony of history, Marxian 'socialism' turns out to be in large part the very state capitalism that Marx failed to anticipate in the dialectic of capitalism. The proletariat, instead of developing into a revolutionary class within the womb of capitalism, turns out to be an organ within the body of bourgeois society" (Bookchin 1971/1986, 207). In short, any form of state socialism will in practice produce state capitalism by increasing the powers of bureaucracy as economic life and the management of industry is handed over to authorities, allowing land, labour, education, and production to become new instruments of tyranny (Kropotkin 1910/2002).

Fortunately in recent years a serious (re)turn toward anarchist thought and practice has begun to challenge and inspire geographers to travel beyond the traditional frontiers of geographical knowledge, which have all too often served to reinforce the

status quo and limit our ideas and imaginations about what is both possible and practical. In 2005, following a 24-year interval, a new issue of *Hérodote* once again dedicated its pages to the continuing importance of Reclus (Lacoste 2005). The Anglo-American geographers were slower to come around, but in 2012, a full 34 years later, *Antipode* published a new special issue on anarchist geographies (Springer et al. 2012). In that same year, *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* also published a special issue on anarchism and autonomy (Clough and Blumberg 2012), while the prestigious Brazilian journal *Cidades* devoted an entire issue to understanding left-libertarian (anarchist, neo-anarchist and libertarian autonomist) contributions to the transformation of urban space and life (Souza 2012). These efforts signalled a desire for a more emancipatory geography and hinted at the possibilities of a geographical turn toward anarchist praxis. Aside from special issues of journals, new books detailing the connections between anarchism and geography are beginning to be published as well. Jim MacLaughlin's (2016) *Kropotkin and the Anarchist Intellectual Tradition*, Philippe Pelletier's (2013) *Géographie et Anarchie: Reclus, Kropotkine, Metchnikoff*, and John P. Clark and Camille Martin's (2013) *Anarchy, Geography, Modernity: Selected Writings of Elisée Reclus* serve as powerful reminders of the continuing importance of the early anarchist geographers and how their ideas continue to resonate with contemporary political, environmental, social, and economic conditions. In a similar vein, Simon Springer's (2016) *The Anarchist Roots of Geography: Towards Spatial Emancipation* and John P. Clark's (2013) *The Impossible Community: Realizing Communitarian Anarchism* pay homage to the influence of these early thinkers, but here the focus is also on taking anarchist geographies in new directions by connecting anarchism to recent developments within contemporary geographical practice and thought. Other recent books bring anarchism and geography together in a different sense, where Michael Schmidt's (2013) *Cartography of Revolutionary Anarchism* and an edited volume by Barry Maxwell and Raymond Craib (2015) called *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms*, attempt to map the global reach of anarchist ideas and its practice. When taken together, these works represent an exciting series of interventions, but there is more work to be done. In realizing the potential of anarchist geographies there are ample opportunities for scholars to take us off the well-trodden paths and beyond the

frontiers of contemporary radical geographical scholarship.

Inspired by these developments and the renewed interest in the melding of anarchist and geographical thought, this book is the first in a three volume series dedicated to transgressing the frontiers of geographical inquiry by foregrounding explicitly anarchist approaches. In particular we seek to push new, heterodox, and transgressive ideas further into the light by illuminating the kaleidoscopic range of geographies that become possible when exploring anarchist lines of flight. Accordingly, the collection aims to strengthen the contributions of both geography and its practitioners in articulating an explicitly anarchist praxis in seeking solutions to the very real human and other-than-human crises that are unfolding across the world today. Our desire is not simply to push the boundaries, but to actively transgress the frontiers of contemporary geographical scholarship by encouraging *the spirit of revolt*. In moving confidently and constructively towards the production of anarchist spaces, we aim to foster new geographical imaginations that energetically cultivate alternative spatial practices. Through the articulation and realization of the idea of transgression, we believe that many exciting directions, inspiring vistas, and reformulated territories will be opened up for scholars and activists to engage with. In the context of transgressing geographical frontiers – whether employed as a concept, a metaphor, or as a point of empirical focus – we are particularly keen to promote the development of three key areas of anarchist geographies: *The Radicalization of Pedagogy* (Volume 1), *Theories of Resistance* (Volume 2), *and The Practice of Freedom* (Volume 3).

The Geographies of Deschooling Oppression

In this first volume on the radicalization of pedagogy, our starting point has been to observe that while anarchist geographies have a long tradition, albeit scattered and temporally diffuse, there has been a limited engagement within the notion that pedagogical concerns have a tremendous latent energy to spark the flames of a more emancipatory politics. While there are some recent notable exceptions, where geographers like Myrna Breitbart (2014), Paul Chatterton (2008), Rhiannon Firth (2014), Farhang Rouhani (2012), and Richard J. White and Colin C. Williams (2012) have offered tremendously important interventions that help us think through the anarchist and

autonomous spaces that can be procured in our educational practices, the connection to pedagogy within anarchist geographies has thus far been only partial at best. This incompleteness is surprising for two key reasons. The first is that anarchism more broadly takes pedagogy as a primary site of resistance and transgression, as it allows for and actively fosters the possibility of building a new world 'in the shell of the old' (Ince 2012). Yet in spite of this longstanding concern among anarchists, the issue of pedagogy has never been one of the primary loci of our collective writing practice. Judith Suissa (2010) identifies this deficit as one of the key weaknesses of contemporary anarchist studies more generally, something this volume hopes to help redress. Yet it isn't just the geographers who are to blame for this void in the literature. Rather anarchist academics could do more to emphasize how their struggles within their own collective organizations and movements can "offer insights into our pedagogical practices and educational spaces" (Haworth 2012, 6). The second reason that the limited engagement of anarchist geographies with pedagogy is surprising is because education is absolutely central to the production of geographical knowledge, and particularly in the production of critical geographies (Castree et al. 2008; Hay 2001a; Heyman 2004; Kropotkin 1885). Nonetheless, a great deal of ink has been spilled on the relationship between the possibilities of freedom and how pedagogies can actively incubate, instill, and inspire a desire for resistance, which provides a significant source of inspiration. Two of the most notable and important contributions to the development of critical pedagogies are Paulo Freire's (1970/2012) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and Ivan Illich's (1970) *Deschooling Society*. While neither author explicitly identified as an anarchist, there are undoubtedly numerous important points of contact with anarchism that can be used to inform anarchist pedagogies (DeLeon 2006; Kahn 2009).

For Illich we can see a connection with anarchist notions of prefigurative politics, or those social relationships and forms of organization that strive to reflect the future society being sought. He argued that, "Most learning is not the result of instruction. It is rather the result of unhampered participation in a meaningful setting. Most people learn best by being 'with it,' yet school makes them identify their personal, cognitive growth with elaborate planning and manipulation" (Illich 1970, 18-19). So there is an experiential component within Illich's views on pedagogy that resonate strongly with an

anarchist 'do-it-yourself' ethic, wherein learning is about *doing* and *being* with others. Recognizing such a connection between prefiguration, pedagogy, and praxis is fundamental to an anarchist politics of anti-oppression (Luchies 2014). For Mathijs van de Sande (2013, 233), "the prefigurative approach is not simply a reformulation of clichéd credos such as 'be the change you want' or 'practice what you preach.' Rather, in prefigurative action such a distinction between 'practicing' and preaching cannot be made." The implication for teaching is that it cannot be separated from the process of learning (Holt 2004), where a distinction can only be retained through an authoritarian logic. Sadly this autocratic condition is something contemporary schooling perpetuates inasmuch as they "pervert that natural inclination to grow and learn into the demand for instruction. … By making men [women, and children] abdicate the responsibility for their own growth, school leads many to a kind of spiritual suicide" (Illich 1970, 27). Kropotkin (1892/2002b, 239) accordingly referred to the school as being "at variance with the wisdom of the 'practical' man" precisely because it is built upon a series of spatial separations that partition our belonging in and curiosity about the world into a readymade knowledge that privileges authority. It is no small wonder then that obedience and patriotism are two of the key lessons of schooling, as the goal is to demand our dependence upon and allegiance to the state, where in order to unfold itself as the 'natural' organization of human relations, it lays upon us an education suited to its perpetuation, not to our desires or needs (Stirner 1844/2010). Consequently, education usually unfolds as a process of imposing, violating, and constraining, even if teachers are loathe to admit it, where "the real educator is he who can best protect the child against his (the teacher's) own ideas, his peculiar whims; he who can best appeal to the child's own energies" (Ferrer quoted in Goldman 1910/2005, 169).

For a critical pedagogy to exist, the necessary precondition is an admission of grace and humility (Kanpol 1999), which involves a decentering of the teacher by actively teaching – or rather *co-learning* – against hierarchy (Spoto 2014; Springer 2016). It is in the rejection of authority that the anarchist threads of Freire are also to be found, becoming particularly manifest in his rejection of the teacher/student dichotomy. Freire (1970/2012) considered traditional education to resemble a 'banking model,' whereby a student is an empty vessel, or 'piggy bank,' that is to be filled with the wisdom and

knowledge of the teacher. The passivity of the student is assumed, while the teacher is positioned as the only agent of change in this imbalanced relationship. The arrangement fundamentally disempowers the learner, but also the teacher by suggesting that she has nothing to learn herself. Under this model, knowledge is available for withdrawal when needed by the student – for exams and certification or for later use – but the consequence is that rather than becoming producers of knowledge, students are instead trained to simply be efficient users of information. This approach accordingly "wields knowledge as an instrument of power and domination that stifles critical thinking, objectifies students, and presents the world as a fixed and abstract reality to which the students are expected to conform" (Heyman 2004, 139). In this respect Freire (1970/2012, 72) argued that, "Education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers *and* students." For a more emancipatory education to emerge, he felt that those committed to liberation must reject the banking concept in its entirety, and instead adopt "a concept of women and men as conscious beings, and consciousness as consciousness intent upon the world. They must abandon the educational goal of deposit-making and replace it with the posing of the problems of human beings in their relations with the world" (Freire 1970/2012, 79). Here again, like in Illich's work, we see a call for greater connection with the experience of life itself and an appreciation for our situatedness within the world. These features have strong implications for the production of geographical knowledge.

In particular there is a certain synergy in Freire's thought with the way that Reclus wanted us to conceive of ourselves as part of a 'universal geography,' which he used to signify our enmeshment within the web of life on the planet and the integral connections between all of Earth's continually unfolding processes (Clark and Martin 2013). David A. Gruenewald's (2003) proposal is much the same, where he takes the position that 'critical pedagogy' and 'place-based education' are mutually supportive ideas, advocating for a conscious synthesis wherein ecological thinking is brought into conversation with human relationships as a means for both decolonization and 'reinhabitation.' The importance of a such a critical pedagogy of place is that it "challenges all educators to reflect on the relationship between the kind of education they pursue and the kind of places we inhabit

and leave behind for future generations" (Gruenewald 2003, 3), thereby situating geography at the forefront of any emancipatory educational praxis. There are further parallels to be found in Richard Kahn's (2010) inquiry into ecopedagogy, which he positions as a form of critical pedagogy wherein economic redistribution, cultural and linguistic democracy, indigenous sovereignty, and a fundamental respect for all life come into contact under an ecologically grounded epistemology. In short, Kahn wants to convene a more awe-inspired relationship with the Earth, seeded by an integral understanding of knowledge that is imbued with physical, intellectual, emotional and spiritual wisdom. To prevent us from seeing these intrinsic bonds between space and power, and particularly our agency within their entanglements, Freire (1970/2012, 139) argued that "The oppressors develop[ed] a series of methods precluding any presentation of the world as a problem and showing it rather as a fixed entity, as something given – something to which people, as mere spectators, must adapt." And so what we have come to accept as 'education' is, in fact, a 'pedagogy of oppression.' Rather than an emancipatory fulfilment, contemporary education typically works to stifle the development of critical thinking and hinder the emergence of any 'revolutionary consciousness.'

From Docile Bodies to Direct Action

Robert H. Haworth (2012, 2) identifies the problem of suppression in his recent collection on *Anarchist Pedagogies*, where he notes that "our schools are inundated with prescribed curriculum and there is very little room to discuss ideas and critical materials outside of the scripted materials." In spite of efforts to transform them, "schools are still dull and lack inspiration, creativity, and spontaneity" (Haworth 2012, 3). School, quite simply, encourages one to become an expert in boredom. Drawing upon 30 years experience as a teacher John Gatto (2009, xiii) explains that "if you asked the kids, as I often did, *why* they felt so bored, they always gave me the same answers: They said the work was stupid, that it made no sense, that they already knew it. They wanted to be doing something real, not just sitting around." Teachers, he continues are every bit as bored as their students, but tend to blame their students who they complain are rude and only concerned about grades, rather than reflecting on the limitations that are placed on everyone involved when confined within the structure of the school. Here, recalling

Michel Foucault (1995), we see how the geographies of the institution of schooling come to create 'docile bodies,' ideal for the obedience required in our postmodern age. The production of docile bodies does not rely explicitly on force, although schools are well known to have employed the mechanism of violence in the past. Instead, subjects are molded through the disciplinary institution itself (i.e., the school, the prison, the hospital etc.), and the forms of authority, surveillance, and capture that are enabled to ensure the internalization of self-discipline (Souza 2006). Anarchist geographer Fabrizio Eva (2012) takes this spatial manifestation of power beyond the institutions themselves, and looks to the wider cultural and social patterns of what he refers to as 'self-caging.' We learn the modes of behavior within institutions, but school, for example, does not occupy one's entire day, and so "the process of caging, of inflexibility produced by iconographies, increasingly involves narratives of freedom of individual choice and/or 'values' freely chosen and often accepted as universal. This is the paradox of self-caging, that is, our 'choice' to voluntarily build our own cage in our daily lives... We feel free because we have 'chosen'" (Eva 2012, 7), which signifies just how lost we are as a society. Schooling perpetuates the myth of freedom by attempting to convince us that we are on an emancipatory path, that we are transforming our lives by learning. Unfortunately the fix is in. How are we free when there is no improvisation and the script has been written for us? What do we actually learn when we are temporally regulated and spatially confined? How much autonomy do we have when someone decides for us what is important, legitimate, useful, and accepted knowledge? "No one is more a enslaved than the man who believes himself to be free and is not" Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1809/1971, 151) once wrote, and his words couldn't be more apt in the context of contemporary education.

For Shoshana Felman (2011, 79), the key task of critical pedagogy is that it "has to deal not so much with lack of knowledge as with resistances to knowledge," where insofar as "traditional pedagogy postulated a desire for knowledge, an analytically informed pedagogy has to reckon with 'the passion for ignorance'." What she means by this is that there is a productive nature to ignorance, it is rooted in a desire to ignore, but this is always performative and not simply a lack of information or incapacity, bur rather an active refusal to acknowledge one's own implication. Ignorance is accordingly akin to

cognitive dissonance, and it becomes an inherited or intergenerational feature inasmuch as schooling enables it. Far from being a process of enlightenment, schooling foregrounds obedience and authority, from primary education right through to graduate studies. Educators John Holt and Pat Farenga (2003, xxviii) have summarized the ruinous effects that schooling has on our collective psyche, suggesting that the modus operandi of contemporary education is to inflict that same conditions of oppression on each successive generation: "People who feel themselves in chains, with no hope of ever getting them off, want to put chains on everyone else." So whether by coercion or capitulation, we are caged, chained, confined, and kept in check by the pedagogy of oppression. Having been "licked into shape" philosopher Max Stirner (1842/2005, 18) observed, "they themselves lick into shape," a process that has nothing to do with educating for emancipation. Instead, through the supposition of inferiority, contemporary education instills subservience and saps the urge to desire via the practices of routinization, tedium, and stultification. To facilitate an exit from this uroboric system of domination bell hooks (1994, 12) calls for a renewal and rejuvenation of teaching, "Urging all of us to open our minds and hearts so that we can move beyond the boundaries of what is acceptable, so that we can rethink, so that we can create new visions." For hooks (1994, 12) this explicitly means celebrating teaching that "enables transgressions – a movement against and beyond boundaries. It is that movement which makes education the practice of freedom." While hooks was not a geographer, we find her metaphor inspiring in helping us to think through what anarchist geographies and their connections to pedagogy might look like. We also appreciate the hint she so eloquently provides in linking the three volumes we have compiled, where pedagogy, resistance, and freedom run together as nodes along a single unfolding process of revolt.

Encouraging people not to trust their own judgement, but to instead differ to the authority of the teacher is a dead end. If educators are to enact any sort of meaningful change, it is their job "to bridge the gap between theory and practice, and make radical discourses accessible to those people who need to understand how systems of oppression work" (DeLeon 2008, 137), not contribute to even more tyranny by positioning themselves above their students. Here the place of both geography and anarchism are imperative. For Kropotkin (1885, np), if geography were to take its rightful place, "it

would assume… the immense task of caring about the humanitarian side of our education." It could reveal our connections, our affinities, our solidarities, and use our differences as points of conversation – not to divide us further, but to encourage our allied contestation in undoing the dominating structures that frame and fracture our lives. The challenge is to develop a critical pedagogy of space that reflects the multiple, unfolding, and contested nature of geography (Hay 2001a; Heyman 2001; Morgan 2000; Springer 2011). The role of anarchism is to embrace its connections to pedagogy more fully, and aim towards "developing and encouraging new forms of socialization, social interaction, and the sharing of ideas in ways that might contribute to revolutionary changes in people's perspectives on society, encouraging broader social changes" (Shantz 2012, 126). Easier said than done of course, but this is where anarchism reveals its real strength, which is located precisely in the geographies of direct action. We need to start rethinking our collective teaching practices and find new and innovative ways to incorporate activism as a key ethos of concern (Chatterton et al. 2010; Hay 2001b; Heyman 2000). By doing so we allow our commitments to learning and to each other to reach beyond the classroom – or we can even consider the freedom that comes from abandoning this space altogether as unschooling encourages us to do (Todd 2012).

Educating for direct action is of course transgressive to existing hegemonies and there undoubtedly will be resistance by administrators who are beholden to the influence of state and capital. Yet by demanding political and social action within our educational processes we start to converge on a convivial space that celebrates our togetherness in defiance of the oppressive practices that want to keep us apart. If we are all born anarchists with an innate curiosity to explore and connect with the world (Springer 2016), then education can be used to cultivate this tendency rather than to suppress it (Amster 2002). Beyond the symbolism of a conceptual transgression, geographical inquiry equips us with the theoretical edifice that enables a tracing of the contours of transgression, which when connected to anarchism, can be transformed into material changes in the world through direct action. This emancipatory claim is precisely what the included chapters in this volume, and indeed each of the subsequent two volumes, all attempt to inspire. Throughout these three volumes it becomes clear that anarchists have developed very different political and geographical imaginations than Marxists. With respect to

pedagogy in particular, its importance for anarchism is demonstrated by virtue of its facilitation of visions for creating a better world through horizontal relationships, voluntary associations, and mutual aid. Pedagogy accordingly represents one of the key sites of contact where anarchist geographies can continue to inform and revitalize contemporary geographical thought in inspiring new ways. Anarchists have long been committed to bottom-up, 'organic' transformations of societies, subjectivities, and modes of organizing, concerns that should be extended to the possibilities of pedagogy. For anarchists the importance of direct action and prefigurative politics have always taken precedence over concerns about the state, a focus that stems back to Stirner's (1844/2010) notion of insurrection in *The Ego and Its Own*, which he framed as walking one's own way, or 'rising up' above government, religion, and other hierarchies. The point was not necessarily to overthrow them, but to simply disregard these structures by taking control of one's own individual life and creating alternatives on the ground. Thus, the relevance of pedagogy to both anarchist and geographical praxes stems from its ability to guide a new way of thinking about the world and as an educational space that is able to foster transgression in ways that liberate and empower.

Structure of the Book

We begin our inquiry into anarcho-geographical pedagogies with Joe Curnow's 'Toward a Radical Theory of Learning: Prefiguration as Legitimate Peripheral Participation.' Here Curnow asks, how do activists learn radical politics? Using ten years of ethnographic data from student movements, he argues that prefiguration is a central mechanism for producing radical consciousness and action, and should be leveraged as a pedagogical intervention. By focusing in on sociocultural theories of learning, Curnow examines the ways that prefigurative action enables social movement activists to learn both the theory and practices of their movements and to shift their tactics toward more radical critiques. He bridges situated learning theory with contemporary discussions of prefigurative politics and theories of praxis in order to suggest that prefiguration must be understood as a political learning process. By using a case study of the United Students for Fair Trade, he traces the learning processes of students in leadership of this national organization. The result is inspiring, where by bringing situated learning theory together with theories of praxis and prefigurative action, we gain a greater appreciation for how

activists can learn through legitimate peripheral participation. Curnow examines the ways that participants have learned and enacted consensus-based decision-making, non-hierarchical leadership systems, and prefigurative anti-oppression processes, arguing that through their embodied engagement in prefiguration, members came to understand the underpinning philosophies, which led them to engage in increasingly critical forms of action. Prefiguration then, as a decidedly anarchist principal, became an active catalyst for shifting strategies to a focus on anti-capitalist and anti-colonial approaches to economic justice. By extending discussions of praxis to include prefiguration, Curnow ultimately reveals the strengths of learning theory to anarchist and other prefigurative social movements.

In the next chapter, 'Radicalizing pedagogy: Geography and libertarian pedagogy between the 19th and the 20th century' by Federico Ferretti, we learn about the roles played by early anarchist geographers like Reclus and Kropotkin in the movement of libertarian pedagogy, popular schools, and university extensions between the 19th and the 20th century. Ferretti also reveals the debates that anarchist geographers became involved in surrounding the foundation of the systems of public and secular education. Specifically, during their exile in Switzerland, these scholars worked in network with other militants and scientists like Charles Perron, founder of the Geneva Cartographic Museum and protagonist of the debates on popular education, and kept international relations with educators like Francisco Ferrer y Guardia, Paul Robin, and Henri Roorda van Eysinga. The movement of libertarian pedagogy, which founded at that time "modern schools" in countries like Spain, France, Switzerland, Great Britain, Italy, United States, Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil, is considered by Ferretti to have influenced the experiences of pedagogic activism and "liberation pedagogies" that followed, as well as authors like Freire. One of the key contributions that this chapter makes is to acknowledge that while many historiographical works exist on this movement, the role of geographers has not been well studied. To understand it, Ferretti argues, it is necessary to deal with two other scholars, James Guillaume and Ferdinand Buisson, protagonists of the transmission of secular and popular education among different nations and different political milieus, who contributed to build the French public school through works like their mammoth *Dictionary of Pedagogy,* with the collaboration of geographers like Franz

Schrader and Reclus, and anarchist educators like Robin. Using an archival approach, Ferretti argues that anarchist geographers had a primary role in the theoretical and practical definition of libertarian pedagogy, and that some anarchist educators (thanks also to the scientific prestige of figures like Reclus, Kropotkin and Guillaume) made a little-known contribution to establish the systems of public and secular schools in several countries.

The next chapter by Levi Gahman seeks to shed light on the complex and contradictory relationships that have arisen due the increasing neoliberalization of the academy. Gahman does so by explaining how these relationships interlock with, and perpetuate, masculinist knowledge production, the recapitulation of colonial epistemologies, and the socio-spatial construction of 'the individual.' In doing so, he embraces Zapatismo for his critique and analysis, titling his contribution 'Zapatismo Versus the Neoliberal University: Towards a Pedagogy Against Oblivion.' More specifically, the chapter conceptualizes Zapatismo (as shared by the Zapatistas), not as a fixed model or hardline doctrine, but rather, as a humble and flexible configuration of practices, principles, and emotions that serve as both 'a bridge and a mirror' to be used in efforts to decolonize and transform society and space. With regards the academy, Gahman creatively uses Zapatismo to theorize how praxis-based autonomous education can be used to create learning environments that are anti-authoritarian, democratic, horizontal, and built upon the foundations of mutual aid and dignity. In stating that the academy is being dramatically altered by the proliferation of neoliberal ideology, Gahman argues that new forms of interlocking power relations are being produced with the already-existing exclusions of patriarchy, classism, ableism, heterosexism, and racism. He suggests that this is evident given that the current modus operandi of the academy sees fit to categorize 'students' and 'faculty' based upon standardized testing procedures, quantitative assessments, ordinal scales of rank, as well as the attainment of state sanctioned grant monies, publications in high-impact (typically corporate) journals, and the attainment of international individual recognition. Such (neo)liberalized hierarchy-inducing practices promote competition, ambition, and personal achievement, which consequently shore up covert power imbalances and normalize exclusion. Thus, drawing from the relational and interlocking approach offered by the shared principles of

Zapatismo, Gahman seeks to interrogate the academy's reliance upon these disciplinary edicts. Highlight how these processes are spatialized, Gahman sheds light on their perpetuation of colonial domination, masculinist supremacy, and banal neoliberal violence. The value of Gahman's approach is that he allows us to envision hierarchy-attenuating possibilities, which he argues may arise when collective resistance and practicing autonomy confront and insurrect the oppressive and enabling status quo of the neoliberal academy.

Ron Horvath is up next with a chapter called 'Pedagogy in Geographical Expeditions: Detroit and East Lansing.' The aim of Horvath's contribution is to recount a peak event in the history of the Detroit Geographical Expedition and Institute (DGEI), an early field intervention within the history of radical geography, in terms of anarchist practice. Horvath argues that if anarchist principles include features like autonomy, voluntary association, self-organization, mutual aid, and direct democracy, then the DGEI theory and practice realized these principles in practice in varying degrees over the active phase of the organization. Horvath addresses two central questions. The first asks us to consider in what sense the DGEI was an example of anarchist practice in general. The second asks to think through the educational and research practices that were embedded within the DGEI, and how these were examples of an anarchist geography. Horvath focuses upon the events that resulted in the School Decentralization Report in order to address both of these questions. While reference is made to the ideas of anarchists and radical pedagogues like Kropotkin, Ferire, and James C. Scott, Horvath acknowledges that none of these thinkers directly influenced the DGEI. Nonetheless, he argues that the parallels between their ideas and the conduct of the DGEI are striking. The non-hierarchical classroom model of education that was used in the DGEI in some ways, Horvath argues, parallels Ferire's methodology. In particular he considers the specific research practices referred to today as 'counter cartography' and 'participatory action research,' and the role that place played in DGEI research, to fit well into an anarchist action research model. Horvath further reflects on the DGEI as being a primarily self-governed voluntary institution, which he recognizes as a core feature of anarchist practice. The chapter also sheds considerable light on why Marxist geographers had difficulties coming to terms with expeditionary practice and expeditionary geography by

noting that the Marxist tradition has historically had a prickly, if not hostile, relationship with various forms of anarchism. For Horvath, the fact that the DGEI focused upon the relations of domination and exploitation that arose out of racism, rather than class, was significant source of tension, hinting again at the econocentrism of Marxian geography.

The next chapter 'Destroy the School and Create a Free School: Digging up the Roots of Dominant/Submissive Complexes and Planting the Seeds of Cooperative Social Interaction' by Erik Taje is a very personal reflection on the ways in which schooling conditions passivity and stultifies creativity. Taje argues that scholastic formal education is organized in a hierarchical, oppressive manner that facilitates the development of dominant/submissive interactions between human beings. While Taje recalls not having a good experience with school himself, the chapter is not merely content to dwell in pessimism. Instead, Taje offers a playful and inspiring take on education, where he argues that its reorganization into a horizontal system in a symbiotic manner will facilitate the development of cooperative, reciprocating interactions between human beings. In short, when aligned to a particular mode of participation and belonging, education can prove to be emancipatory. Taje begins his inquiry by outlining the functions that the modern school performs, and by documenting its evolution into the contemporary, state-sanctioned school system. He explains how places of formal education have been designed to teach children, and indeed to reinforce in adults, certain forms of normativity. Schools tell us, Taje argues, how to be, and to interact as dominant or submissive, authoritarian or obedient. Such a dichotomous understanding of human relationships is, to Taje, detrimental to our capacity to live happy and fulfilling lives. He further argues that redesigning the educational landscape has the potential to free humans from dominant/submissive complexes, encouraging us to see beyond a binary system of power relations. Taje accordingly also seeks to demonstrate how more productive social qualities are fostered by such a redesign of education. Finally, he conceptually maps out a series of different approaches that humans could potentially take to redesigning education. Here, Taje draws upon the various projects undertaken by the *free school* movement from the end of the 19th century up to the present day, which again provide a unique light on the ways in which anarchism is a decidedly geographical imperative.

Adopting a very creative method in their exploration of the intersections of

anarchism, geography and pedagogy, Kye Askins and Kelvin Mason's chapter 'Fuller Geographies and the Care-full Co-production of Transgressive Pedagogies, or "Who Cares?"' is a game changer in terms of how we approach geographical inquiry. They consider 'fuller geographies' as an emerging practice of transgressive pedagogies, and do so by being explicitly transgressive in the way they have written up their scholarship. Moving beyond defending the public university against neoliberalization, Askins and Mason argue that fuller geographies incorporate *schole* as a revolutionary project for developing our full humanity beyond a capitalist political economy. They illustrate how theory and practice can be compellingly interlinked by offering a script for a piece of Forum Theater, the result of which is nothing short of stunning. Askins and Mason flip the whole discussion of pedagogy and anarchism on its head, through a transgressive act of writing that pushes geography well beyond its usual haunts and comfortable confines. Aside from the lesson this offers us on how we think about scholarship and the claims to legitimacy that surround this question, the piece is extremely useful in terms of the way in which it mobilizes a feminist ethics of care within the practice and pursuit of radical pedagogies, and especially within our everyday conducts. For Askins and Mason, an ethics of care must underpin progressive social movements and activist practices, and yet this notion remains a relatively unexplored domain, not least as an aspect of transgressive pedagogies. Reciprocal care is key to transforming power relations, confronting hierarchies, and fostering diversity, which has distinct implications for anarchist geographies and how we might conceive the spirit of revolt. Askins and Mason, in a beautifully inspired piece, address this deficit by analyzing care for the self, unpacking understandings of 'empathy', and considering the relationality of caring and interdependence, as constituents of lifelong pedagogical projects. In short, they advocate that fuller geographies require us to be more open and aware of others' feelings and experiences in relation to our own. Accordingly, they propose that deeply *care-full*, fuller geographies begin to exemplify transgressive pedagogies, which can be developed across academia, especially among those working with/in social movements.

In the chapter that follows, 'Anarchism and Informal *Informal* Pedagogy: 'Gangs,' Difference, Deference,' Richard McHugh explores 'gang' cultures and the spaces that are constituted as sites of radical pedagogy. Hugh's starting point is to

examine Freire's pedagogic project, which he recognizes as having been critiqued based on its ties to religion, masculinity, and the morality it espouses. These features therefore potentially make Freire's proposals anti-emancipatory by reflecting normative moral positions. Yet beyond the professional Informal Education economy that has engaged with Freireian thinking, there is a range of informal *informal* pedagogic practices, such as those within what is commonly described as 'gang' cultures that Hugh suggests can potentially salvage Freire's project. Just as a person does not awaken one day and know how to be a surgeon, so too, Hugh contends, no person awakens and knows how to be in a 'gang.' The pedagogic processes are arguably no less rigorous for the 'gang' than they are for the medical profession, and both can carry consequences of life and death, yet radical pedagogy within 'gang' cultures is a dismissed and illegitimated one. Hugh seeks to redress this by attending to the nuances and complexity of informal *informal* pedagogy, and how such pedagogy may occupy the space of anarchism, capitalism, deference and difference simultaneously, acting as both a referent of liberation and a reflection of oppression. Hugh's chapter accordingly engages with ideas of difference and deference in a Derridaian sense, where he considers that perhaps the difference and deference of anarchistic or informal *informal* pedagogy within 'gang' cultures is more than it appears. That is, such a pedagogic approach is more about teaching one how to think rather than what to think, by unshackling the mind from structural positions that have conditioned the thought of gang members. While there is scope for emancipation here, paradoxically an informal *informal* pedagogy can re-shackle the mind to the boundaries of 'gang,' suggesting there is no simple panacea to the question of education.

Francisco J. Toro's chapter 'Educating for Earth Consciousness: Ecopedagogy within Early Anarchist Geography' is next, where he returns our attention to the work of Kropotkin and Reclus in particular. For Toro, dominant approaches to environmental management have often focused on effects and technological solutions, relegating the driving forces of ecological problems and the role of human beings in the background. Official, state-sanctioned environmental discourse commonly overlooks the connections between needs, educational process, knowledge production, and the physical environment from its etiology of environmental crises. This oversight affects the procedures of an official environmental education on both children and adults alike, where Toro argues

that scholars have mainly focused on corrective measures and reductionist approaches to complex environmental problems. Here Toro looks to Reclus, and his notion of "Man is nature having become self-conscious" as a potential solution for the loss of awareness that we are currently experiencing in our symbiotic connections to our world. To this end, Toro suggests that classical anarchist geographers have left a legacy of reflections, concepts, and proposals that can help us to restore a more harmonious understanding of human-nature relations, where an ecopedagogy can more appropriately grapple with the social, economic, and political questions that underpin environmental problems. As a radicalization of education, ecopedagogy promotes not only a more holistic understanding of environmental concerns, but is based on cooperative and autonomous principles that correspond closely with anarchism. Toro reviews the long environmentalist tradition among early anarchist geographers, mapping the main contributions that they have offered in establishing theoretical foundations for a more complete environmental geography. In unpacking these contributions, Toro proposes radical ideas for ecopedagogy based on new alternatives and experiences beyond the official discourse of 'sustainable development' that instead follow anarchist educational precepts.

The next chapter is called 'Cycling Diaries: Moving Towards an Anarchist Field Trip Pedagogy' by Ferdinand Stenglein and Simon Mader. Here, the authors take us through their own personal journey of being part of a biking community that sought to create a moving anarchist geography through the practice of cycling together. For Stenglein and Mader, the moving community they participated in was created by people travelling together on bikes, who sought to open up a space for non-hierarchical and horizontal community organization, recalling Hakim Bey's notion of *Temporary Autonomous Zones*. Their activities enabled them to interact with existing decentered autonomous multiplicities along their route, even as they themselves maintained a similar overarching goal. Stenglein and Mader consider this process as having opened up a process of *unlearning*, wherein the contingency of their identities, social practices, and institutions were revealed and re-formed in a practically embedded process. For the authors, unlearning is considered as a double-sided movement. It is a withdrawal from the hegemonic structures of domination, habitual practices, and identities imprinted in

each of us, while unlearning is simultaneously also a process of forming new practices and identities. This open process was, for Stenglein and Mader, the transgression into a *terra incognita*, which points to social contingency, meaning a transgression of themselves as well. For this transgression, moving together as a group became central in two ways. On the one hand, moving allowed them to visit places of alternative formations and resistances along their chosen path, to interact with these groups and reflect on the evolution of different, non-capitalist social formations. On the other hand, moving together was a practical process whereby self-organization could be lived. The interaction with and practice of kaleidoscopic autonomous spaces provided Stenglein and Mader with multiple possibilities for transgression. They were a group of people who organized a collective moving experience, where their pedagogical approach sought to transcend the classical didactical methods especially dominant in academia. They focused on unlearning by transgressing hierarchical roles and challenging a mere knowledge transfer through experiential learning. For Stenglein and Mader, their activities transgressed the fault lines between abstract theories and self-experience, which is a vitally important lesson for those interested in the possibilities of radicalizing pedagogy. The self in its relations to others became the object and subject of this open *(un)learning* process that Stenglein and Mader engaged, and accordingly they perceive the moving community – wherein anarchist practices can be exercised – as offering an important lesson for pedagogy within academia.

In the final chapter of this volume 'Learning Through The Soles of Our Feet: Unschooling, Anarchism, and the Geography of Childhood,' Simon Springer argues that schooling is a form of misopedy and a fundamental structure in conditioning societal acceptance of domination in other registers. For Springer, the subordination of children begins with the misguided notion that they are incapable of autonomy, reinforcing a dichotomous understanding of adult/child or teacher/student. Schooling, in short, is the process whereby we learn the forms of hierarchy and authority that become the lifeblood of our contemporary political and economic systems. Yet more than that, Springer argues that the school is the sanctimonious altar upon which the innocence and curiosity of our children is sacrificed. Given the contemporary commonplace understanding that children simply must attend school, he draws upon his own experiences as an unschooling parent

and the profound confusion that people often exhibit when they find out that his children do not attend. Yet for Springer schooling should not be confused with education. He argues that the former represents the interests of oppression, molding societal consciousness to accept the conditions of subjugation. In contrast, Springer argues that education in its idealized form is a process of self-discovery, an awakening to one's potential, and a desire to see such abilities realized. To ensure the absence of coercion in education children need to explore for themselves, making their own decisions about what their interests are, and how those curiosities might be fulfilled. He suggests that presenting a broad range of opportunities is crucial, but the decision about what path to follow should be determined by the child. When bound to a classroom we often mistake obedience for education, yet learning, as geographers recognize, best occurs 'through the soles of our feet.' For Springer this means that when children explore the world through unschooling they live into their creative potential, opening an aperture on alternative ontologies. Unschooling is consequently, one of the most powerful forms of anarchism we can engage, and an educational process that is entirely suffused with geography.

For Anarcho-Geographical Pedagogy: A Call to Action!

There is no easy solution when it comes to countering the politics of hierarchy and domination for they are multiple, malignant, and mercurial, continually mutating to manipulate us in new and unexpected ways. While education has often been touted as a path to freedom and enlightenment, all too often it operates as a mechanism that stupefies through the promotion of ignorance, prejudice, and submission to authority. By bringing anarchism into conversation with geography we can begin to recognize the power that exists within the *here* and *now* (Springer 2012), where through practices like direct action and mutual aid, we have the distinct collective and individual ability to unsettle and disrupt the various systems of oppression that structure our daily existence. For some this emancipatory power is apparent. Anarchists in particular consider the struggle against domination as constitutive of their identity, yet for most of humanity the logic of hierarchy has made deep roots, often settling into how people view their place in the world. Fortunately the establishment of such an order is not impervious to damage, where the radicalization of pedagogy can be a means to undoing the hold that particular forms of authority have on our lives, and specifically the way they situate us in relation to

others. For education to live into its promise of liberty we consequently advocate for a pedagogical recognition of learning as a shared space, where knowledge is produced as a collective engagement of exchange, as opposed to a structured and unidirectional transfer from 'top' to 'bottom.' As such, we refuse the distinction between 'teacher' and 'student,' insisting that we are instead all *co-learners*. In advocating for an anarcho-geographical pedagogy our purpose with this volume is not to set out a curriculum that others can follow in achieving their desired emancipatory outcome, a task that could only lead to the same routinized and dull version of education that predominates in our schools and universities today. Instead our purpose is to actively transgress this very idea.

While the chapters that comprise this book offer hints on what we can potentially do to dislocate contemporary education from its hierarchical frame, these are mere suggestions and not cure-all solutions that can be universally applied to any given setting. For example, while practices like unschooling represent a general, anti-authoritarian pedagogic philosophy and can surely be advocated under certain circumstances, from a perspective that is sensitive to the hard realities of most countries within the so-called 'global south,' it is important to acknowledge that some particularities must be taken into account in the conceptualization and realization of radical education. The slogan 'more schools, less jails' can be heard on the streets of Brazilian *favelas* for instance, while for poor single parents who have to work many hours a day, certain pedagogic strategies may not be available to them. For other families, public schools offer an opportunity for their children to have a free meal, which may be the only available option to ward off hunger. All of these scenarios demand other intelligent adaptations to subvert the influence of the hierarchies that become embedded in state-sponsored educational programming. In short, it is necessary to develop emancipatory strategies in a way that consider the diversity of situations found across the world. Our hope is to inspire other educators – whether as grade school teachers, community activists and organizers, or university professors – to reexamine their positions vis-à-vis their students, and to assist in the broader struggle over education by encouraging the production of spaces for creation, wherein innovative approaches, original ideas, and new opportunities for learning can be explored. We want to promote a willingness to take the risk of making up our pedagogic practices as we go along and in concert with others, so that what an anarcho-geographical pedagogy might

look like is limited only by our collective imaginations and the strength of the relations we forge.

If "the fluid characteristics of anarchism and the pedagogical processes that individuals and collectives engage in are situated and nestled into the different educative spaces we inhabit" (Haworth 2012, 3), then our only insistence is that these geographies are beautifully vast. Education is not, and should never be a single formulation, but whatever it is, it should make us nonconformists; equip us with an unique spirit that enables the courage needed to confront challenges; allow us to embrace values that will guide us through life; make us spiritually rich and in love with who we are, what we are doing, and who we are with; teach us what actually matters and what is merely water under the bridge; and ultimately, it should help us learn how to live and how to die (Gatto 2005). And so we want to replace the notion of education as preparation for life, a view that only perpetuates the hierarchies that Illich and Frerie rejected, by instead conceiving of education as life itself. "Stop thinking schoolishly. Stop acting teacherishly" unschooling advocate Sandra Dodd (2002, np) argues, "Stop talking about learning as though it's separate from life." The reality we should all be confronted with is that there is no beginning or end to learning. It is a process that is with us from the cradle to the grave, where every single moment of our lives is part of our education. While the process of schooling begins in childhood, it is only through ageism and arrogance that we can envision adults as the lone bearers of knowledge. Children know how to live in the world better than most people, where their curiosity, self-fulfillment, and even their periodic bouts of boredom and subsequent bursts of creativity are a testament to their innate wisdom. We are all born of the Earth, so necessarily we know something of it right from the moment of our births.

All too often young people, and children in particular, are seen as the people of tomorrow, and not the people of today. But they are entitled to be taken seriously children's advocate and author Janusz Korczak (1929/2009, 7) argued, to be treated by adults as equals, with tenderness and respect, where "they should be allowed to grow into whoever they were meant to be – the unknown person inside each of them is the hope for the future." Yet so much of our contemporary education system is built upon the installation of fear, where the fear of failure in particular is the primary lesson our

children are being taught, a lesson that serves only to jeopardize our collective future. Lest the weight of shame rest heavy on their shoulders, young people are made to perform to a certain standard that is set not by themselves or in consultation with their interests and abilities, but rather in the name of 'education' itself. This ritual of humiliation shouldn't necessarily surprise us, particularly when we acknowledge that young people are consistently one of the most denigrated and oppressed groups, a pattern that repeats across both history and geography. Nonetheless, subjugation through schooling is the name of the game, since free children are not easily influenced, and the mechanisms of authority require capitulation. For educator John Taylor Gatto (2009, xxii) "Once we understand the logic behind modern schooling, its tricks and traps are fairly easy to avoid. School trains children to be employees and consumers; teach your own to be leaders and adventurers. School trains children to obey reflexively; teach your own to think critically and independently." Yet how do we transform these words on a page into actions in the world? How can the radicalization of pedagogy be made to leap from this book and materialize in actual existing practice? For Kropotkin the answer was easy. In his *An Appeal to the Young*, he argued that "When we have but the will to do it, that very moment will justice be done: that very instant the tyrants of the earth shall bite the dust" (Kropotkin 1880/2002a, 282). So it is *action itself* that calls *action* into being. Courage, devotion, and sacrifice are required ingredients, but it is through direct action that new ideas may take root in people's minds and bring about lasting transformation. Insofar as the radicalization of pedagogy is concerned, this volume is not intended as a final word. It is instead a modest contribution to the larger unfolding story of exploration and invention that informs the heart of anarchism. But more than mere words, above all, it is a call to action, an awakening of the *spirit of revolt*!

References

Amster, R. 2002. Anarchist Pedagogies for Peace. *Peace Review* 14(4): 433-439.

Bookchin, M. 1971/1986. "Listen, Marxist!" In *Post-Scarcity Anarchism*, 193-242. Montreal: Black Rose.

Breitbart, M. M. 1978. "Introduction." *Antipode* 10: 1-5.

Breitbart, M. M. 2014. “Inciting Desire, Ignoring Boundaries and Making Space: Colin Ward’s Considerable Contribution to Radical Pedagogy, Planning and Social Change.” In *Education, Childhood and Anarchism: Talking Colin Ward*, edited by C. Burke and K. Jones, 175-185. New York: Routledge.

Castree, N. Fuller, D., Kent, A., Kobayashi, A., Merrett, C. D., Pulido, L., and Barraclough, L. 2008. “Geography, Pedagogy and Politics.” *Progress in Human Geography* 32(5): 680-718.

Chatterton, P. 2008. “Using Geography to Teach Freedom and Defiance: Lessons in Social Change from ‘Autonomous Geographies.’” *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 32(3): 419-440.

Chatterton et al. 2010. Chatterton, P., Hodkinson, S., and Pickerill, J. (2010). Beyond Scholar Activism: Making Strategic Interventions Inside and Outside the Neoliberal University.*Acme: An international e-journal for critical geographies*, *9*(2): 245-275.

Chouinard, V. 1994. “Reinventing Radical Geography: Is all that’s left right?” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12: 2-6.

Clark, J. P. 2013. *The Impossible Community: Realizing Communitarian Anarchism*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Clark, J. P. and Martin, C. eds. 2013. *Anarchy, Geography, Modernity: The Radical Social Thought of Élisée Reclus.* Oakland: PM Press.

Clough, N. and Blumberg, R. 2012. “Toward Anarchist and Autonomist Marxist Geographies.” *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 11(3): 335-351.

DeLeon, A. 2006. “The Time for Action Is Now! Anarchist Theory, Critical Pedagogy, and Radical Possibilities.” *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 4(2): 72-94.

DeLeon, A. 2008. “Oh No, Not the ‘A’ Word! Proposing an ‘Anarchism’ for Education.” *Educational Studies*, 44(2): 122-141.

Dodd, S. 2002. “Deschooling for Parents.” *Home Education Magazine.* September/October. http://sandradodd.com/deschooling.html

Eva, F. 2012. “Caging/Self-Caging: Materiality and Memes as Tools for Geopolitical Analysis.” *Human Geography. A New Radical Journal*, 5(3): 1-14.

Felman, S. 2011. *Jacques Lacan and the Adventure of Insight: Psychoanalysis in Contemporary Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Firth, R. 2014. “Critical Cartography as Anarchist Pedagogy? Ideas for Praxis Inspired by the 56a Infoshop Map Archive.” *Interface: a Journal for and About Social Movements* 16(1): 156-184.

Foucault, M. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Freire. 1970/2012. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Gatto, J. T. 2005. *Dumbing Us Down: The Hidden Curriculum of Compulsory Schooling*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

Gatto, J. T. 2009. *Weapons of Mass Instruction: A Schoolteachers Journey Through the Dark World of Compulsory Education*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

Goldman, E. 1910/2005. *Anarchism and Other Essays.* New York: Cosimo.

Goldman, E, 1935. “There Is No Communism in Russia.” *American Mercury*, Volume XXXIV, April 1935. http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-there-is-no-communism-in-russia

Goethe, J. W. 1809/1971. *Elective Affinities.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gruenewald, D. A. 2003. The Best of Both Worlds: A Critical Pedagogy of Place. *Educational researcher* 32(4): 3-12.

Harvey, D. 1973. *Social Justice and the City*. London: Edward Arnold.

Harvey, D. 1982. *The Limits to Capital*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. 2015. Listen, Anarchist! A Personal Response to Simon Springer's "Why a Radical Geography Must Be Anarchist." *Davidharvey.org* http://davidharvey.org/2015/06/listen-anarchist-by-david-harvey/

Haworth, R. H. 2012. "Introduction." In *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories, and Critical Reflections on Education*, edited by R. H. Haworth, 1-10. Oakland: PM Press.

Hay, I. 2001a. "Critical Geography and Activism in Higher Education." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 25(2): 141-146.

Hay, I. 2001b. "Engaging Lessons: Classrooms as Sites of Engagement in Activist Critical Geography." *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education* 10(2): 168-173.

Heyman, R. 2000. "Research, Pedagogy, and Instrumental Geography." *Antipode* 32(3): 292-307.

Heyman, R. 2001. "Why Advocacy Isn't Enough: Realising the Radical Possibilities of the Classroom." *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education* 10(2): 174-178.

Heyman, R. 2004. "Inventing Geography: Writing as a Social Justice Pedagogy." *Journal of Geography* 103(4): 139-152.

Holt, J. 2004. *Instead of Education: Ways to Help People Do Things Better.* Boulder, CO: Sentient Publications.

Holt, J. and Farenga, P. 2003. *Teach Your Own: The John Holt Book of Homeschooling.* Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.

hooks b. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Illich, I. 1970 *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harrow.

Ince, A. 2012. "In the Shell of the Old: Anarchist geographies of territorialisation." *Antipode* 44(5): 1645-1666.

Kahn, R. 2009. Anarchic Epimetheanism: the Pedagogy of Ivan Illich. In *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academy*, edited by R. Amster, A. DeLeon, L. A. Fernandez, A. J. Nocella, and D. Shannon, 125-135. New York: Routledge.

Kahn, R. 2010. *Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kanpol, B. 1999. *Critical Pedagogy: An Introduction*. Wetport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.

Korczak, J. 1929/2009. *The Child's Right to Respect.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Kropotkin. 1880a. "Appeal to the Young." In *Peter Kropotkin, Anarchism: A Collection of Revolutionary Writings* edited by R. N. Baldwin, 260-282. New York: Dover.

Kropotkin. 1880b. "The Spirit of Revolt," In *Peter Kropotkin, Anarchism: A Collection of Revolutionary Writings* edited by R. N. Baldwin, 34-43. New York: Dover.

Kropotkin, P. 1885. "What Geography Ought to Be." *The Nineteenth Century CXXVI*, 18 December: 940-956. http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/kropotkin/whatgeobe.html

Kropotkin. 1892/2002. "Revolutionary Government." In *Peter Kropotkin, Anarchism: A Collection of Revolutionary Writings* edited by R. N. Baldwin, 236-250. New York: Dover.

Kropotkin, P. 1910/2002. "Anarchism - Encyclopedia Britannica Article." In *Peter Kropotkin, Anarchism: A Collection of Revolutionary Writings* edited by R. N. Baldwin, 283-300. New York: Dover.

Lacoste, Y. 1981. "Élisée Reclus, un Géographe Libertaire." *Hérodote: Revue de Géographie et de Géopolitique* 22.

Lacoste, Y. 2005. "Hérodote et Reclus." *Hérodote: Revue de Géographie et de Géopolitique* 117.

Luchies, T. 2014. "Anti-Oppression as Pedagogy; Prefiguration as Praxis." *Interface: A Journal For and About Social Movements 6*: 99-129.

MacLaughlin, J. 2016. *Kropotkin and the Anarchist Intellectual Tradition*. London: Pluto Press.

Mann, G. 2014. "It's Just Not True." *Dialogues in Human Geography* 4(3): 271-275.

Maxwell, B. and Craib, R. 2015. *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms*. Oakland: PM Press.

Morgan, J. 2000. "Critical Pedagogy: The Spaces that Make the Difference." *Pedagogy, Culture and Society* 8(3): 273-289.

Peet, R. 1977. "The Development of Radical Geography in the United States." *Progress in Human Geography* 1: 240-263.

Pelletier, P. 2013. *Géographie et Anarchie, Reclus, Kropotkine, Metchnikoff et d'Autres*. Paris: Éditions du Monde libertaire and Éditions libertaires.

Rouhani, F. 2012. "Practice What You Teach: Placing Anarchism In and Out of the Classroom." *Antipode* 44: 1726-1741.

Shantz, J. 2012. "Spaces of Learning: The Anarchist Free Skool." In *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories, and Critical Reflections on Education* edited by R. H. Haworth, 124-144. Oakland: PM Press.

Schmidt, M. 2013. *Cartography of Revolutionary Anarchism.* Oakland: AK Press.

Souza, M. L. de. 2006. *A Prisão e a Ágora*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil.

Souza, M. L. de. (ed.) 2012. "Introdução: a Geografia, o Pensamento e a Práxis Libertários e a Cidade− Encontros, Desencontros e Reencontros." *Cidades* 9(15).

Spoto, S. 2014. Teaching Against Hierarchies: An Anarchist Approach." *Journal of Feminist Scholarship* 7(8): 2015.

Springer, S. 2011. "Public Space as Emancipation: Meditations on Anarchism, Radical Democracy, Neoliberalism and Violence." *Antipode* 43(2): 525-562.

Springer, S. 2012. “Anarchism! What Geography Still Ought to Be.” *Antipode* 44(5): 1605-1624.

Springer, S. 2013. “Anarchism and Geography: a Brief Genealogy of Anarchist Geographies.” *Geography Compass* 7(1): 46-60.

Springer, S. 2014. “Why a Radical Geography Must Be Anarchist.” *Dialogues in Human Geography* 4(3): 249-270.

Springer, S. 2015. “The Limits to Marx: David Harvey and the Condition of Postfraternity.” Unpublished paper. https://www.academia.edu/12638612/The_limits_to_Marx_David_Harvey_and_the_condition_of_postfraternity

Springer, S. 2016. *The Roots of Anarchist Geography: Towards Spatial Emancipation*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Springer, S; Ince A; Pickerill J; Brown G; and Barker A J. 2012. “Reanimating Anarchist Geographies: A New Burst of Color.” *Antipode* 44: 1591–1604.

Stirner. 1842/2005. “The False Principles of Our Education.” In *No Gods, No Masters: An Anthology of Anarchism*, edited by D. Guérin, 17-20. Oakland: AK Press.

Stirner. 1844/2010. T*he Ego and its Own: The Case of the Individual Against Authority*. Gloucester: Dodo Press.

Suissa, J. 2010. *Anarchism and Education: A Philosophical Perspective*. Oakland: PM Press.

Todd, J. 2012. “From Deschooling to Unschooling: Rethinking Anarchopedagogy After Ivan Illich.” In *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories, and Critical Reflections on Education*, edited by R. H. Haworth, 69-85. Oakland: PM Press.

Van de Sande, M. 2013. “The Prefigurative Politics of Tahrir Square–An Alternative Perspective on the 2011 Revolutions.” *Res Publica* 19(3): 223-239.

White, R. J. and Williams, C. C. 2012. “The Pervasive Nature of Heterodox Economic Spaces at a Time of Neoliberal Crisis: Towards a ‘Postneoliberal’ Anarchist Future.” *Antipode* 44: 1625–1644.